

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 7 and 13 to 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 2, 8, 13, 17 to 22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,930,468) in view of Loffler (U.S. Pat. No. 5,010,820). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. as modified by Loffler and further in view of Rai et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0149747). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. as modified by Loffler and further in view of Yacoub (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0011805). Claims 5, 6, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. as modified by Loffler and further in view of Bauer (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0039461). Claims 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and Bauer and further in view of Tada (U.S. Patent 4,572,652). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. as modified by Loffler, Bauer and Tada and further in view of Silvester (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0161292). Claims 14, 15, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. as modified by Loffler and further in view of Pfeiffer et al. (U.S. 5,447,102). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. in view of Loffler, Bauer and Jackson et al. (U.S. 7,064,848).

Claims 1, 2, 13 and 16 to 18 have been amended.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application based on the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claims 1 to 7 and 13 to 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 2, 13 and 16 to 18 have been amended to correct the language the Examiner indicated was indefinite. Thus, claims 1 to 7 and 13 to 25 are submitted as being clear and definite and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 8, 13, 17 to 22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,930,468) in view of Loffler (U.S. Pat. No. 5,010,820). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. as modified by Loffler and further in view of Rai et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0149747). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. as modified by Loffler and further in view of Yacoub (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0011805). Claims 5, 6, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. as modified by Loffler and further in view of Bauer (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0039461). Claims 14, 15, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. as modified by Loffler and further in view of Pfeiffer et al. (U.S. 5,447,102). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. in view of Loffler, Bauer and Jackson et al. (U.S. 7,064,848).

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the same reasons discussed in the Appeal Brief filed September 15, 2009. Based on the arguments submitted in the Appeal Brief filed September 15, 2009, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 1 to 6, 8, 9 and 11 to 25 is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and Bauer and further in view of Tada (U.S. Patent 4,572,652).

Bauer and Tada are cited for allegedly disclosing the additional limitations of claims 7 and 10 not present in claims 1 and 8 and do not cure the deficiencies of Zingher and Loffler with respect to claim 1, upon which claim 7 depends, and claim 8, upon which claim 10 depends. In view of the above arguments with respect to claim 1 and claim 8, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 7 and 10 is respectfully requested.


Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher et al. as modified by Loffler, Bauer and Tada and further in view of Silvester (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0161292).

Silvester is cited for allegedly disclosing the additional limitations of claim 11 not present in claim 8 and does not cure the deficiencies of Zingher, Loffler, Bauer and Tada with respect to claim 8, upon which claim 11 depends. In view of the above arguments with respect to claim 8, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris
(Reg. No. 38,156)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940